

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

**September 21, 2000
California State University, Channel Islands
Lecture Hall I
One University Drive
Camarillo, CA 93012**

I. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rob Reiner at 9:50 a.m.

Chairman Reiner paid tribute to Commissioner Siegel's contributions to the childcare community and presented her with a commendation by the Speaker of the Assembly, Robert M. Herzberg, in appreciation for her work as a member of the California Children & Families Commission in particular and as an advocate for child care in general. Commissioner Siegel expressed her appreciation and gratitude for the opportunity of working for the Commission in her chosen field.

II. Roll Call.

Present were Commissioners Kim Belshe, Sandra Gutierrez, Susan Lacey, Karen Hill-Scott, Louis Vismara, Ex-officio member Ed Melia and Chairman Reiner.

Staff Present: Jane I. Henderson, Ph.D., Executive Director; Emily Nahat, Acting Deputy Director for Program Management; Elias Lopez, Deputy Director for Research Management; Patti Huston, Chief of Governmental Affairs; Barbara Marquez, Program Management Office; Judy Stucki, Program Management Office; Roberta Peck, Program Management Office, Lupe Almer, Analyst; Frank Furtek, Legal Counsel; and Janie Daigle, Legal Counsel.

III. Approval of Minutes, July 20, 2000 State Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Belshe moved, seconded by Commissioner Gutierrez to approve the July 20, 2000 minutes. The motion passed by a roll call vote of 5-0-1 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Reiner, Lacey, and Belshe voting "YES", no "NO" votes and Commissioner Karen Hill-Scott abstaining.

IV. Welcome.

J. Handel Evans, President of California State University, Channel Islands welcomed the Commission.

Supervisor Kathy Long, Chair of Venture County Children & Families Commission made

Approved October 19, 2000

welcoming remarks.

V. Chairman's Report.

Chairman Reiner reported that seven additional strategic plans were received from Colusa, Stanislaus, Marin, Yuba, Mendocino, Shasta and Solano, bringing the total of strategic plans to 42.

Chairman Reiner referred to an article in *Newsweek* regarding understanding of autism, which is of great interest to the Commission. He cited statistics mentioned in the article as it relates to young children. Dr. Vismara commented on the article as well as from personal experience.

Chairman Reiner next provided an update from the *Safe From the Start* conference. The purpose of the meeting was to explore strategies to help children exposed to violence. The conference resulted in six regional conferences and nine regional forums have been formed. The forums will be held by the end of the year, three in October, two in November and three in December. One was held in Fresno. The last forum is planned to be held in Los Angeles on December 14th. Interested parties can look up dates and sites at the *Safe From the Start* website as well as on the Commission's website.

Chairman Reiner announced that the Packard Foundation's contract with the Technical Assistance Center will run out at the end of this year, but he assured the Commission that there will be an orderly transition from the TA Center as it currently exists to one that will continue and there will be no break in services. Input from the local commissions would be appreciated in ensuring this smooth transition.

Chairman Reiner reported on a meeting he had with Sharon Davis regarding bringing in the Governor and the resources from the State level to enhance the State Commission's work re Prop 10. A visit was made to the Elizabeth Learning Center, a model of how to coordinate services in a family resource center with respect to school-readiness, and a meeting the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health & Human Services, the Heads of the Departments of Health Services and Social Services was subsequently convened resulting in a very productive first meeting. A new initiative focusing on school readiness will hopefully be announced early next year and will be part of the Governor's overall plan for improving public education.

Commissioner Melia underscored how important that meeting was in that it showed how much Prop 10 is creating the context for collaboration at the local level. He commended Chairman Reiner for his ability to bring together so many powerful individuals in support of the State Commission's efforts at collaboration.

Chairman Reiner next welcomed and introduced the new Commissioner, Karen Hill-Scott.

Approved October 19, 2000

Commissioner Gutierrez reported on a meeting organized by the Ventura County Commission consisting of two panels focusing on childcare, emphasizing on client needs. Referring to the *Safe from the Start* conference, Commissioner Gutierrez felt the rare opportunity of partnering with law enforcement on issues involving children should be taken advantage of. She suggested that the Commission have a regular discussions on the subject of potential partnerships with law enforcement in children services. With regard to the Technical Assistance Center the Diversity Committee would like issues of diversity, special needs and related be part of the new work.

Chairman Reiner reported on the launch of the *Kit for New Parents* scheduled to be released in October in four counties. Alameda County will distribute the kit through a number of venues and the kit will also be tested in Santa Clara, Modoc and Lassen counties, utilizing a variety of distribution means. A large WIC agency in Los Angeles County will also be part of this program. The ultimate goal is to have the kits available in January throughout the entire state and to distribute them to every parent and care giver of every child born in California. The pilot program will give the Commission information on distribution strategies.

VI. Master Plan for Education

Jane Henderson advised that the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education to date has distributed its draft framework, which specifically proposes the appointment of a variety of working groups to look at issues in education having to do with student learning, governance, finance, facilities, professional development, work force preparation, and so forth. The framework does propose an early childhood education component for inclusion in the Master Plan. The framework actually states that the Joint Committee will collaborate with the California Children & Families Commission to identify the most appropriate means by which the objectives for early childhood education can be achieved.

Several meetings were held with the Chair of the Committee, Senator Dede Alpert, and she has asked the Commission to take responsibility for securing the research and making the policy recommendations for the early childhood education component of the Master Plan. The request would be to produce a research-based product to the Committee, including policy recommendations which the Committee would then use or not, and incorporate or not, into their Master Plan. The report would be due to the Committee by January of 2002.

Dr. Henderson relayed that the Committee felt very strongly that the Master Plan would not be complete without examining and making recommendations for the early childhood component. There would be a variety of pros and cons that Commissioners need to consider, one of which is the impact on the Commission's workload and the impact on

Approved October 19, 2000

the objectives and priorities that the Commission adopted at its July meeting. At that time, the Master Plan was on the list, but it did not rise to one of the levels of first priorities. Another issue is that this is going to be very labor intensive and would have to be on a very fast time line. The initial estimate to do the report is \$500,000. There is the possibility that the Committee would accept the report or the recommendation could be rejected or accepted in part. Discussion ensued about this report being a stand-alone document, which the Commission could distribute. This project would be in line with the goal of the Commission in terms of school readiness and it would provide a wonderful opportunity to begin to partner with the Legislature.

The future of the outcome of the Master Plan is unknown and it is not known whether extensive conversations with the Governor's Office or the Secretary of Education have taken place. Staff also recommended that one or two Commissioners be assigned to work as a liaison with the Joint Committee and with the staff in taking on this endeavor.

Commissioner Lacey stated that any early childhood care and education component of a Master Plan should include prenatal care and related services and considerations. Chair Reiner agreed, stating the plan should present what constitutes school readiness and part of school readiness is prenatal services. He also felt that there should be assurance that this would be a stand-alone document.

Commissioner Gutierrez noted she had some concern, and would like to get clarification about the confusions among the three or four Master Plan bills before committing any funds.

Commissioner Vismara stated he echoed and shared Commissioner Gutierrez' concerns and had no doubt there is a need for this document, but that the Commission should be really clear on what the goals and objectives are. If the Joint Committee would want to look at enacting legislation in the foreseeable future, it should seek the Governor's input and active participation.

Dr. Melia thought this is a tremendous opportunity to influence the recognition and importance of the preschool child. The Commission's commitment is to school readiness and educability of children, and below that is a commitment to the child as learner from infancy and from the prenatal period. This is one more opportunity for the Commission to work with the education establishment.

Commissioner Belshe also had some reservations. The Commission staff is already struggling to keep up with all the important work that is currently underway and the Commission needs to think through very carefully how it can be maximally useful in informing the conversation around the issues with the Master Plan. Commissioner Belshe would like to see a fleshed out proposal as it relates to the scope of this work, the approach that will be taken, the time lines associated with it, and the nature of the relationship between the Commission and the Legislative Committee. She recommended

Approved October 19, 2000

supporting approval of sufficient resources to allow staff to undertake that investigative work and then hear back from staff in terms of what this undertaking would involve, and also making sure staff has the resources necessary to make it as successful as possible without totally diverting all its attention from all the other priorities and objectives that are currently underway. CCommissioner Belshe further pointed out that one of staff's recommendations is that there be a Commission liaison to the Legislative Committee, and given that the Commission has a wonderful new asset in Dr. Karen Hill-Scott ,who would be willing, would be a very effective representative of the Commission.

Commissioner Hill-Scott outlined three broad issues that relate to this proposal. One is context, the second is strategy, and the third is process. With regard to the third issue, which is process, the Commission wants to be successful and have this report have real impact. If this goes forward, the report should be crafted so that it has impact both ways, as a stand-alone document and as an integrative part of an overall plan.

Dr. Henderson admitted there were a lot of questions on the table, which could not all be answered. Public comment might provide some additional insights. It would be difficult to come back with a plan and do a feasibility study and answer the many questions posed in the time that is available. As far as funding, the kindergarten-university workgroups are being supported by outside funding from foundations. This Joint Legislative Committee was authorized by legislation enacted in 1999; there's no funding from the Legislature.

Chairman Reiner stated that if the part of this plan that focuses on k-university is being funded separately, there is a problem because the only way a Mast Plan for Education that involves early childhood development can be created is to work together in a holistic way. If this is a process in which staff can work together with the people who are doing the k-university piece, it will present a tremendous opportunity.

Chairman Reiner suggested going back to Dede Alpert to find out exactly how this process would work. Would the Commission be integrally involved in the creation of this Master Plan, or would the Commission be working separately on a separate project.

A discussion followed on how and why this request with regard to the Master Plan came to the Commission. Emily Nahat explained in great detail the dialog and flow of information between the Commission and the legislative parties.

Dr. Henderson noted that some of the other organizations that are being asked to participate in the study are extremely highly esteemed organizations and that this was intended to be a very high level document that will be used and serve as a resource for the education community and beyond.

Public Comment.

Approved October 19, 2000

Kay Ryan, the Executive Director of the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee, stated that since she began with CDPAC in December, the Master Plan has been their number 1 priority issue. It was also a high priority issue for a number of other groups, as evidenced by the fact that there were four bills introduced last year. There were signs from the Administration early on that they were not supportive of a Master Plan for early care and education at that point in time, but it was thought that CDPAC could contribute and could further the cause by creating a public dialogue and a common language, to get people talking to each other about what they meant when they said a "Master Plan." It became a "Master Plan for Early Care and Education." CDPAC has been developing a framework,- talking about what it is, and who it is for and what the two potential purposes and uses could be. One is that it could provide a template to the Administration so that when they looked at things like the Administrative Review of Financing, the four bills on the floor, and other proposals that came up, they could use the template to evaluate them. It could also provide a recipe for whoever ended up ultimately building the plan. Since March, when CPAC joined forces with the United Child Care Campaign and Child Care Law Center, three meetings were conducted with a broad constituency group. As a result of those meetings, more than 100 stakeholders representing agencies, organizations and prospective, including Child Care Resource and Referral, local planning councils, state, and county offices got together to talk about the critical elements to be included in a Master Plan. From their perspective, to be for all children up to age 14 and children with disabilities up to age 21. The planning process needs to be inclusive. You couldn't hire the best consultant to go someplace, develop the plan, and present it. It needs to be a process that people bought into, believe in, and participated in. The plan should serve as a road map for public policy and guide future decision-making. CDPAC and the United Child Care Campaign will spend the next month finalizing and refining the framework documents they have been working on. By mid-October, stakeholders will receive the final drafted document from those meetings, and then begin seeking endorsements from their respective organizations.

Ms. Ryan said that if the Committee should decide to take this on, she was optimistic that it will do an excellent job and CDPAC will enthusiastically support this effort in any way it can, either by continuing to provide a public forum for issues if that would be helpful, or by being part of the planning. Should the Commission choose to take this effort on, Ms. Ryan said she'd be happy to arrange a presentation of and about the completed framework document they have been working on.

Nancy Strohl, representing the Child Care Law Center, stated they worked as one of the eight statewide agencies in the United Child Care Campaign, which includes the California Resource and Referral Network, the California Child Development Coalition, CAPA, which is the Alternative Payment Association, the California Child Development Administrator's Association, the Child Development Policy Institute and the Ed Fund, and the California Association for the Education of Young Children. This broad grouping of statewide providers and teachers for the last two years has been working on the development of a Master Plan for early care and education and out-of-school care. Ms.

Approved October 19, 2000

Strohl indicated that she would definitely volunteer on behalf of the Law Center to help forge the connections between those statewide organizations and to bring those organizations and the parents' organizations that have worked on this into the process. Not only all the stakeholders and the people in power should be involved, but also the parents of children with disabilities, parents of children and families that are migrant families, those that have been excluded from this child care and early development system and for whom it doesn't work, and find affirmative ways to reach out to them. Outreach is done in many languages, hearings and meetings are held in many parts of the State. The plan developed is both rooted in the best possible research, the best thinking and best practices, and also in the concerns and challenges that are faced from those that are most disenfranchised. For the Child Care Law Center this is certainly one of its top policy priorities. The other organizations in the United Child Care Campaign would welcome an opportunity to work with the Commission, as well as the many other partners. Ms. Strohl hoped the Commission will take this on.

Sharon Hawley, representing Michael Jett, who is the Division Director at the Department of Education's Child Development Division, relayed the Department of Education's interest and support of this initiative. The Master Plan is very complex, and the plan the Commission is considering linking with is focusing on the delivery system of education, which is K through 12 and is acknowledged as the system that needs some sort of a plan to link with the university and community college plan that has been in existence. One of the early discussions that began with the Department of Education when the Commission was formed was what kinds of ways can we partner with the Commission, and it became apparent that the field of early childhood definitely needed to have a Master Plan. Ms. Hawley explained that the Department of Education actually has done a number of reports and she suggested using them as another resource as far as concept and philosophical approach and information that could definitely enhance and help build this particular Master Plan. Their programs do serve children, birth through age 14, and Ms. Hawley offered to provide information and background that would be comprehensive in nature and would support a Master Plan.

Dr. Henderson offered to try and answer some of these core questions and get back to the Commission with as many answers as possible. She suggested exploring the questions with Senator Alpert directly and committed to do so.

Chairman Reiner suggested the Commission bring the Master Plan issue back for discussion next month and make a much more informed decision about this.

Commissioner Hill-Scott pointed out that on the issue of context, it has been made clear that there are key people in the Legislature who want the Commission to do this work and the stakeholders from the community have asked the Commission to jump in and do it because the legislation attempted previously has failed. So there is support from two key areas across a broad base of stakeholders that the Commission undertakes this effort. The remaining issues really are more issues of strategy and process. The guidance received

from the public comment has been to build on what has already been done, to not reinvent the groundwork, and to optimize the position that has already been established in terms of the stakeholders to achieve the time lines. It seems like some of the concerns that were raised have been taken care of and that the issue is much more the nuts and bolts of how to do it and to giving staff the authorization to move forward with a plan, of what it would cost, the actual working proposal, the actual working document. Her recommendation was to get funding for going forward, not knowing exactly how the mechanics would work. The issue for the Commission is to approve it in principle because it can always be halted.

Dr. Henderson agreed that that is the decision the Commission must make. The reality is that in going forward with this, staff has to be able to schedule meetings, locate and probably pay for meeting rooms, hire consultants to help do this. To expect finding highly qualified people who can drop everything else they're doing for a year and come work on this, and do so on a moment's notice is challenging.

Ms. Nahat thought that time could be spent exploring, but it would be nice to have some direction because staff would invest a lot of time starting to think about those kinds of contracts for staff and facilities, etc. In order to get some questions answered before going forward, staff should spend the next month, start looking into actual more specific costs, consulting costs, estimating how many public meetings there will be, etc.

Commissioner Belshe questioned if this would be a true partnership collaboration that is going to contribute to a seamless document, or, would the relationship to this Joint Committee be really more of serving in a consultative capacity that results in the Commission making recommendations that may or may not be patched onto the work they're doing independently. She thought this to be the critical question in terms of the relationship with the Committee.

Emily Nahat said that in the first discussion meeting with legislative committee staff, problems with not having that seamless kind of document were discussed, even in higher education alone. They said it caused too many barriers even between community college and the other segments, and they are quite interested in that seamless kind of work. Whether people understand what it means and what the implications are should be explored further.

Chairman Reiner indicated that this item will be tabled until the next meeting on October 19, 2000 in order to get clarification on the many questions raised.

VII. Approval for the Release of a Request for Proposal for Community and Media Outreach.

Kristina Parham clarified that item VII is the community and media outreach component of the public education campaign, which is the public relations component. The RFP for the public education campaign spoken of in the past is the advertising RFP that was

actually released on September 1st. Today's agenda item will be discussed in two stages; the first one being the Commission's approval to begin writing the RFP for the public relations component of the overall communications program and looking at all the components this RFP should include.

Ms. Parham detailed the framework, which consists of public relations work for the State Commission, the Technical Assistance communications work for the county commissions, the diverse audience outreach work, looking at a clearinghouse function and a community-based organization program that would be run through the State Commission in partnership with the county commissions.

Commissioner Belshe inquired if the Commission will receive a draft of the RFP for approval of the recommended activities at the October meeting. If so, she cautioned that important decisions need to be made in terms of strategy, priority funding, etc. and that the Commissioners must have ample opportunity to review the recommendations put forward in order to provide knowledgeable input and/or changes in the recommendations for the RFP.

Commissioner Vismara asked if at some future date Ms. Parham would share her recommendations on advertizing evaluations so that at the end of a time certain, it can be ascertained how the Commission has invested its money, and how it was used and what the advocacy results were.

Responding to Dr. Henderson's request for clarification, Ms. Parham indicated she was asking the Commission for approval to develop the RFP, and then come back to the Commission at the October meeting for final approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Vismara moved, seconded by Commissioner Hill-Scott to approve for the staff to develop an RFP for Community and Media Outreach.

Public Comment

Guadalupe Alonzo from MALDEF asked that the media and outreach campaign should have an holistic perspective and that the Commission and particularly the media, should affirm and acknowledge the potential for services funded specifically by the county commissions to act as a safety net for the lack of access to early childhood development services. The use of non-traditional and non-mainstream media outlets such as bilingual and monolingual services should be encouraged.

Graciela Orozco representing Radio Bilingue, a Latino 501C3 grassroots community organization, based in Fresno expressed support for the statewide allocation of resources for community media. This is going to be a very wise investment as the funds will allow community grassroots media to organize a network of information related to Prop 10, local and statewide efforts. The funds will also allow for statewide mini-campaigns such

as services to the farm worker/migrant populations or for healthcare services for thousands of children who are part of this vulnerable population. This investment will provide for community volunteers to receive information in a more organized and coordinated effort allowing communities to interact with one another. Ms. Orozco described Radio Bilingue's unsuccessful efforts to obtain county commissions' funding and asked the State Commission to fund these efforts.

Brenda Blasingame from Contra Costa County emphasized the importance of strongly coordinating this effort with the local commissions, individually and regionally. The local commissions know of and have hired people locally that are doing the public affairs, communications and media. This needs to be tightly woven and coordinated between the state and the local level so that the message will get out there, enabling the local commissions to communicate back to the State Commission what the needs are and how the message should be crafted.

VOTE: The motion to approve the development of an RFP for community and media outreach carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Reiner, Lacey, Belshe and Hill-Scott voting "YES, no "NO" votes and no abstentions.

VIII. Approval for Funding of a Pilot Project for Evaluation.

Dr. Henderson introduced Dr. Elias Lopez, the Commission's Research Director who joined the staff one month ago.

Dr. Elias Lopez briefly described his background. He requested the Commission for approval to conduct a pilot program with funding of up to \$500,000 to (1) to try and develop a set of core indicators which will provide a meaningful statewide picture to the Legislature, (2) to find out what kind of technical assistance counties need in order to do this kind of work, and (3) to find a way to work with the counties in such a way that the counties feel they have some ownership with this project.

Responding to an inquiry by Chair Reiner, Dr. Henderson explained that the background of this proposal was for staff to come back to the Commission to request funding for the issuance of an RFP for a major statewide development of reporting indicators and the like and based on the Results Document adopted by the Commission. There is not enough time to go through the extensive RFP process in order to meet the needs of the county commissions that are funding programs right now. They have requested that the process be speeded up. Staff will be able to contract with IBM as a prime contractor with a subcontract to SRI to develop a pilot program during the next few months. By January staff hopes to be able to release an RFP and select a contractor who will then build on this preliminary work, carrying it forward. This funding is intended to support those county commissions who have asked the Commission to work with them in terms of developing

some tools that they can use.

A lengthy discussion followed on the proposal for funding the pilot project.

MOTION: Commissioner Gutierrez moved, seconded by Chairman Reiner to approve funding in the amount of \$500,000 to conduct a pilot project for evaluation.

Public Comment

Dorinda Ohnstad, Executive Director for Kings County Children & Families Commission, Interim President for the Statewide Executive Directors Association stated that this whole pilot project was really initiated by the executive directors. There needs to be a consistency statewide with regard to the implementation of Prop 10, which is challenging given that there are 58 county commissions of which a number have already made significant investments in this evaluation process. The key issue from the executive directors' perspective is that Prop 10 was all about results-based accountability and looking at things in a new way, not business as usual. The executive directors felt they want to influence this RFP and that the RFP should be able to capture the story of Prop 10.

Gregory Fearon advised that on October 17th there will be a statewide conference of the Health Data Managers of the state and a panel presentation will be given on Prop 10's evaluation ambitions and hopes. This is not to duplicate, but to collect information that will be put in the plans about immunizations, et al in a partnership. What can be decided at the local level is the strategic plan and how the 58 strategic plans are melded into a state view is the objective. Absent any other objectives or outcomes, SRI chose what was in the strategic plans, but the commissions are farther down the road now. There are much more specific outcomes that are to be measured and everybody has taken to heart measuring outcomes with appropriate reliable indicators. Together, both the state's needs and the county commissions' needs can be served and this is where the pilot project can help.

Brenda Blasingame, Contra Costa stated that the original conception was to come up with a set of common indicators towards the outcomes that are stated in Proposition 10, so that everybody could be collecting data on the same things at the local level. Right now the idea is to conceptualize this and think about how to do it, meaning that doing the work during this interim period, before the RFP goes out for the big, long term evaluation contract, would set the foundation and the framework for that contract.

Pat Wheatley, Santa Barbara County said that her commission had been pushing the hardest for this, mainly because the first quarterly reports are due at the end of September and the time line for the second RFP process has been developed. Santa Barbara County has been asking for something extremely simple and that is that in the first year a common language for reporting can be agreed upon. Santa Barbara has established and

has developed a very extensive evaluation program with UCSB. This proposal needs to be done in a true partnership as a process with the county commissions. She cautioned that there needs to be sensitivity to the reality of staffing since a lot of the commissions are extremely stretched in that regard. To come up with a system that is reflective of the diversity of the counties, staffing and budgets presents a true challenge. This also applies to the grassroots systems in the various counties. The county commissions are also looking for guidance and direction with regard to confidentiality, because this is a major issue that will require state support.

Commissioner Gutierrez inquired from Brenda Blasingame if this proposal would be something the county commission would want to use and if it was useful.

Ms. Blasingame suggested backing off of focusing on the tools and the data collection pieces of paper and going to a more conceptualizing starting there from the big picture and working from there, with the objective of getting a clear picture of what the RFP would contain for the state's long term evaluation. The RFP should be set up in such a way that the right evaluator will be obtained. This proposal will not do this, but with some redesigning the RFP can portray exactly what the Commission's vision is on evaluation and what the Commission is looking for.

Dr. Henderson suggested a modification of the proposal. Basically, the deliverables proposed was the development of a set of base-line indicators, the development of an evaluation guidebook, the development of reporting tools based on common indicators would be eliminated, as long as a common language is developed which will provide knowledge of where to start and then include early thought on the implementation of this process statewide. What that really means is to develop the concept that will be used in the issuance of the RFP. Dr. Henderson inquired if those modifications in the proposal would be satisfactory.

Responding to Dr. Henderson's suggestion, Dorinda Ohnstad agreed and thought that what really was being asked by the county commissions was to have less decisions up front as to what this pilot is going to include and let the process drive itself. It really comes down to working with the county commissions to look at how to tell and measure the story of Prop 10. She suggested to make more of a modification and not necessarily determine evaluation guidebooks etc., but to develop a common concept, common language to move forward with the evaluation.

Commissioner Hill-Scott pointed out that the time allotted and the task that needs to be done are completely incompatible. It is an infeasible job to have a pilot study, an RFP and a real evaluation all start within the next quarter. The front end time in figuring out what needs to be done, how to measure it, what is the story to be told is so much more critical than actually collecting the data. She expressed concern about the front-end time. A pilot is where a decision is made about what the indicators are and what the construct of the evaluation will be and what the instruments to be used will be. All that is tested out so

that when the actual evaluation is done, there can be certainty as to the validity of it.

Dr. Henderson described the dilemmas facing her staff and asked the Commission to provide the money up front providing staff the ability to be flexible, but that the intent of the project is to work together with the county commissions and with a contractor to begin the development of a common language to report results, to develop whatever tools may or may not be needed, and this can be left out if needed, and also to use this group collectively to design the parameters of the RFP, at least the major concepts that will go into it.

A lengthy discussion followed on this issue, culminating with the decision to change the project to *provide seed money to start the process by which to arrive at an RFP for evaluation*, in lieu of a *pilot project for evaluation*.

AMENDED MOTION: Chairman Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Lacey to appropriate \$500,000 to start the process by which to arrive at an RFP for evaluation.

Friendly Amendment by Commissioner Vismara: With the understanding that this new process will include issues related to diversity and children with disabilities right up from the front and not until later.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 5-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Lacey, Belshe, Hill-Scott and Chairman Reiner voting “YES, no “NO” votes and no abstentions.

Hannah-Beth Jackson addressed the Commission and the public.

IX. Approval of Planning Grant for Demonstration Project in the Central Valley Related to Coordinate Services.

Emily Nahat presented the planning grant request which followed the June meeting in Hanford where the Commission heard some really compelling presentations about issues facing Central Valley farm worker families. This proposal is consistent with the Commission’s objectives and priorities, identifying a demonstration program of coordinated services serving the Central Valley region. The proposal was submitted by Kern County on behalf of seven counties; Kern, Kings, Tulare, Fresno, Madera, Merced and Stanislaus. They are requesting planning funds for a two-part study phase. The first part is a feasibility study to determine costs and identify potential funding sources and partners to provide coordinated services for the families in this region. The second part of the study phase is a regional plan for a demonstration project, linking quality childcare, the schools and family resource centers for the target population. The request is for \$ 49,350 for the feasibility study and work plan. The immediate goal is to increase the

number of children receiving quality childcare and long-term results include plans to increase school readiness and improve family functioning and to provide a model for replication and to serve other areas of the state. The timetable is that by April 1st of 2001 these counties will submit a final project and expenditure report, including the plan to implement services for these families. Most of the costs are consultant services to work with the seven counties and others, their various partners to develop the feasibility study and work plan.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked to include the Hmong refugees in the study group and this proposal and/or a separate proposal.

MOTION: Commissioner Lacey moved, seconded by Chairman Reiner to approve funding for a planning grant in the amount of \$49,350 for a demonstration project in the Central Valley related to coordinated services.

Dr. Henderson commented that in a discussion with former Commissioner Bob Ross, who is now the Chairman for the California Endowment who asked to convey to the Commission that the Endowment is actively exploring a number of issues having to do with farm workers in the Central Valley. They have conducted a survey of farm worker health and that study is going to be released in October or November and the report will be shared. Mr. Ross indicated that this was a potential area for partnership for the State Commission as well as the county commissions with the Endowment.

Public Comment

Terri Thorfinnson, representing California Primary Care Association/Community Clinics stated that in her experience with the farm workers issue, one of the things that is very critical in reaching vulnerable populations is outreach. She hoped that any plan would integrate services in coordination with the counties, would include the community-based networks of clinics. There is a very successful outreach network that already connects with farm workers and hard-to-reach populations.

Guadalupe Alonzo with MALDEF commended the Commission for being very receptive to the needs of farm worker families. Over 70% of farm workers are actually Latinos or of Latino descent and out of these farm workers over 40% actually live below the federal poverty level. This means that there are families of four or more individuals that have an income of less than \$17,000 a year. The median annual wage income for farm workers is actually less than \$9,000 and that is for a full time, year-around person who works more than 40 hours a week and gets paid less than \$9,000 a year. Obviously the need for childcare is very important in terms of being able to provide persons with sustainability for economic development.

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara,

Gutierrez, Lacey, Belshe, Hill-Scott and Chairman Reiner voting “YES”, no “NO” votes and no abstentions.

X. Discussion of time line to Implement the Commission’s Objectives and Priorities adopted at the July meeting.

Jane Henderson referred to the handout containing a chart showing all the State Commission’s objectives and priorities, both the ones that were completed as well as the ones that were approved in the July meeting. Dr. Henderson stated that she wanted to discuss what the steps are that staff needs to take in order to take those objectives and priorities to an implementation phase.

The first set of initiatives deal with the public education campaigns and the media outreach. The RFP to develop and maintain the advertising on public education program over the next three years has been released. Ms. Parham earlier presented a request for an RFP on the community-based organization outreach campaign the public relations campaign. This will be brought back in October for approval to be released in November.

Building statewide capacity and infrastructure development with the ultimate goal of helping county commissions work with their families and children in order to improve the quality and accessibility of program are the two major initiatives around supporting the development of standards, curricula and education materials as well as providing training materials and technical assistance. Staff hopes to come back in November with concept papers for both the development and dissemination program standards for family resource centers, home visitation programs and integrated outreach service delivery systems, as well as developmentally appropriate, culturally linguistic appropriate materials for childcare and development providers, including unlicensed providers.

A proposal was submitted to the Commission by the University of California in conjunction with the Lung Association to provide physician and provider training on tobacco cessation programs for pregnant women. There are issues having to do with whether or not this would be statewide implementation or a pilot program. Staff will come back in November with some options on this.

The effort to continue to provide support and technical assistance to county commission will be studied to see what alternatives are available beginning in January. The safety initiative approved by the Commission last January was based on supporting and adding to a proposal that was in the Governor’s budget, which was changed in the legislative process. Staff is now working with the Department of Social Services to look at what some other options might be since that initiative is no longer in existence as staff had anticipated.

Next Dr. Henderson addressed prior agreements already in place, in particular the issue of

offering enhanced professional compensation. The Commission adopted the proposal to provide matching funds to county commissions for efforts to link and reward training and compensation for childcare providers. This is tied to primarily AB 212 by Dion Aroner that was passed at the end of the legislative session. \$15 million were set aside for that, but the legislation has been amended dramatically. The money now flows through the California Department of Education to local childcare planning councils. There are issues to be worked out with both the county commissions as well as the CDE and the local planning councils on how best to set that up. Staff will come back in October with a concept paper and to release an RFP in November.

Staff will come back to the Commission in November with a concept paper on the immunization project. An award grant date is not proposed until July of 2001 and the reason for that is that this has to go through the budget process in order for the Department of Health Services to have authority to expend the Commission's funds. The same thing may be true with the early intervention inclusion specialist project. The funds will continue to stay in the Commission's account and will bear interest.

In the area of research and evaluation the pilot project has just been modified and the dates will be changed accordingly. With regard to the survey and analysis of policy maker and public opinion staff believed that there will be an opportunity to implement that through an inter-agency agreement which will be brought to the Commission in October, as will the analysis of parent education, consumer education, family support providers materials and programs, with a projected release of the RFP in December.

With regard to the project conducting a statewide household survey of health care and developmental needs of young children for which the Commission approved \$2 million, staff is conversing with the California Health Interview Survey folks at UCLA who are conducting this. There may not be enough information in the work they are doing focusing on young children to support a \$2 million investment. Funding for that was reduced in the Governor's budget and this will be put on hold until a determination can be made to go forward with that level of funding for it, based on what will come out of it.

The master plan for early care and education is a new item and staff will come back in October to revisit this issue.

A general discussion followed on the various aspects of Dr. Henderson's report.

There was no public comment

XI. Approval of Additional Appointees to the Advisory Committee on Diversity.

Barbara Marquez reported on the first meeting of the Diversity Committee on Monday, September 18th. Prior to the meeting nominations were received from the Association of California Counties Children and Families executives, nominating three of their executive

directors, Brenda Blasingame, representing Contra Costa County, Rafael Lopez, representing Santa Cruz County, and Donna Michelson from Modoc County.

MOTION: Commissioner Gutierrez moved, seconded by Commissioner Melia to approve Brenda Blasingame, Rafael Lopez and Donna Michelson as additional appointees to the Advisory Committee on Diversity.

Commissioner Gutierrez noted that the role of the Diversity Committee will be presented to the executive directors at their next meeting in Napa.

There was no public comment

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Lacey, Belshe, Hill-Scott and Chairman Reiner voting “YES”, no “NO” votes and no abstentions.

XII. Commissioner Calendar for Remainder of 2000 and 2001.

Jane Henderson advised that there were regularly scheduled meetings for October, November and December, however, since the December meeting falls on December 21st this date may be in doubt due to being so close to the holidays. The December meeting date could be changed or bypassed altogether.

MOTION: Commissioner Belshe moved, seconded by Commissioner Melia to change the December 21st meeting date to December 14, 2000.

There was no public comment

VOTE: The motion passed by a roll call vote of 6-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Lacey, Belshe, Hill-Scott and Chairman Reiner voting “YES”, no “NO” votes and no abstentions.

Chairman Reiner noted that a suggestion was made for the Commission to meet every other month in order to give staff more time to do their work, but after further discussion it was decided to revisit this issue at a later date.

The suggested upcoming meeting dates will all be on the third Thursday of the month, except for December 13th.

It was also suggested to hold a meeting in Sacramento every other month due to the interaction with the many state agencies and alternate between the different counties for the other meetings, however, the county commissions would prefer meeting in the different counties and only go to Sacramento when necessary.

MOTION: Commissioner Vismara moved, seconded by Commissioner Belshe to accept the schedule for the meeting dates in 2001 as proposed by staff.

There was no public comment

VOTE: The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-0-0 with Commissioners Vismara, Gutierrez, Lacey, Belshe, Hill-Scott and Chairman Reiner voting “YES, no “NO” votes and no abstentions.

XIII. Closed Session: Discussion and Status Report from Legal Counsel regarding pending Litigation:

1) California Association of Retail Tobacconists, Inc. et al. v State of California, Board of Equalization of the State of California, California Children and Families First Commission and Kathleen Connell, as Controller of the State of California, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 732079; Government par. 11126(e)(1) and 11126(e)(2)(A).

2) Cigarettes Cheaper! And The Customer Company v. Board of Equalization of the State of California, Kathleen Connell, as Controller of the State of California, and the California Children and Families First Commission, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC743506; Government Code par.11126(3)(1) and 11126(e)(2)(A).

3) McLane/Suneast v. The Board of Equalization and the State of California, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. GIC743505; Government Code par. 11126(e)(1) and 11126(e)(2)(A).

A closed meeting was held to receive information from legal counsel.

XIV. County Commission Reports: Ventura, Santa Barbara and Los Angeles.

Kathy Long, representing the county commission of Ventura County, updated the Commission on the great strides in the services and the care that is being afforded the county’ young children and their families as a result of the funds that have been derived from Prop 10 and as an extension of the State Commission’s efforts. She gave a brief history of her commission and introduced two new members, Dr. Bob Levin and Charles Watson. She especially emphasized one outcome of the strategic plan, the concept of Neighborhoods for Learning, which has been favorably recognized by regional and state officials as an exceptional, local accomplishment that embodies the spirit of the Prop 10 legislation. One of Ventura County commission’s next task is the Center for Excellence, to ensure that quality improvements for the commission will occur through training and program evaluation. The Center is intended to provide an opportunity to engage the community in the evaluation programs and services for children. The commission is also developing a financial plan that will include a process for the expedient use of an

allocation of the funds. In order to leverage funds work is in progress to develop a community investment fund that will assist small organizations who are attempting to expand their operations and services to children.

Claudia Harrison, Ventura County Executive Director presented some of the Ventura County Commission's projects to the Commission through several associates.

She then briefed the Commission on the Neighborhood for Learning initiative, a key initiative to assure school readiness. It represents \$6.5 million in funding, representing 55% of Ventura county commission's annual funding. It is a concept that was kicked off in a countywide conference. Ms. Harrison detailed the components of the Neighborhood for Learning project.

Nicole Singer, representing the Santa Barbara county commission presented the Commission with a brief overview of their programs, funding allocation and projects. She reported that recently an advisory board has been formed which resulted from community input and members of that advisory group will serve on the leadership team. A plan is being developed to highlight what is really going on with some of these programs at the community level.

XV. County Commission Executive Directors' Report.

Dorinda Ohnstad, Interim Director of the Association of California County Children & Families Executives recalled that the association was formerly formed in June of this year. At this point in time the membership reflects 73% of California's children zero to five and continues to grow. The goal is still to include all 58 counties to be involved and committed in the process of working together towards a common vision for California's youngest children. Part of the process of achieving this was working with the Packard Foundation. In July Packard provided the association with a commitment to fund the cost of travel for the 26 counties receiving less than \$1.5 million annually to ensure their full participation in the Prop 10 process. To date, 13 of the 26 counties have taken advantage of this opportunity. She thanked Packard Foundation for their support of the association and its work.

During the last few months the association has evolved, making it necessary to acquire staff and developing its own organizational structure. Last month Orange County generously provided the association with an interim staff person, Cathy Night *. Jane Henderson has also offered office space or any other support the association might need. With this assistance the association is now situated to be an effective partner with the State and county commissions and be a leader and advocate for promoting the Prop 10 vision both at the local, state and federal level. The association is dedicated to ensuring that technical assistance and training needed to accomplish the goals of Prop 10 are readily available to all 58 county commissions, their grantees and community members. The association is establishing committees, which will be able to provide county

commissions with a vehicle for addressing particular issues that are high priority.

XVI. Report on the First Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Diversity.

Commissioner Gutierrez provided a brief report on the successful launch of the Advisory Committee on Diversity. The next meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2000.

XVII. Executive Director's Report.

Dr. Jane Henderson introduced Roberta Peck, who will be the expert on coordinating services for parent education.

A brief report on the summer conference followed. The next conference will be held February 8th and 9th in San Diego. Motivational keynote speakers are very well received; they keep the battery recharged.

Like the county commission, the State Commission is required to undergo an annual audit. Staff has asked the Department of Finance to conduct the audit and they are in the process of doing that. Although the primary emphasis is on fiscal areas, it also includes performance assessments and they are looking at the Commission meeting its statutory mandates, if staff is implementing the directives of the State Commission, etc. In conjunction with that, staff will come back in October with the Commission's budget and a business plan.

There was no public comment.

XVIII. Communications Director's Report.

Kristina Parham advised that the *Kit for New Parent* prototype will be presented at the October meeting and that at that time the pilot program will be explained in greater detail. Ms. Parham referred to copies of a new outdoor campaign that has just been launched. She also provided a brief update on the ad RFP which was launched on September 1st. The final decision will be made by September 16th and the contract start date is January 1st.

Lea Mitchell provided an overview of the January through June media campaign with the aid of slides. This included results of the campaign from a media buying standpoint, and a general overview of the general market media plan.

Public Comment

Nicole Singer stated that in the next RFP round it will be increasingly important to look at those markets that may not have been hit through this initial launch, because in some of

the communities may not fall within the primary main media markets.

Dorinda Ohnstad noticed that being from the Central Valley it is obvious that the entire Central Valley was locked out of the 86.3% coverage. She stressed not to forget or overlook the real targeted population that need to see this message.

Lea Mitchell explained that a certain amount of dollars is available and the goal is to do as good of a job in the primary media type, which in this instance was television statewide, and then the secondary media, which was radio statewide, and the tertiary medium was outdoor. The tertiary medium could only be utilized in the top five markets. Next year, with additional funding, this lack of outdoor campaign in the areas left uncovered, will be remedied.

Chairman Reiner added that all of the efforts should be a little more skewed towards reaching under served areas.

Kristina Parham noted that this was the beginning of the statewide campaign, but in the next contract there will be more localized advertising.

XIX. Legislative Update.

Patti Huston advised that the Governor has until the end of this month to act on the bills on his desk. The Commission took positions on eight bills this year and seven of those made it to the Governor's desk. She referred the Commissioners to her handout containing the status of the bills. AB 212 the Aroner bill was signed by the Governor yesterday. She pointed out that the Governor has vetoed one of the bills, SB 179 which would have provided \$50,000 sustainability grants to Healthy Start programs. That bill was pared down to just \$1 million and the Governor still vetoed it. She read the Governor's reasons to veto the bill to the audience. Ms. Huston felt that another version of this bill will be forthcoming next year. A full report on the remaining bills will be provided at the October meeting.

There was no public comments

XX. Adjournment

There being no further business, upon motion by Chairman Reiner, seconded by Commissioner Lacey, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.